

OCT 27 1923

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVII, No. 4

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1923

WHOLE No. 454

Motion Pictures for the School

From the
George Kleine Cycle of Film Classics

JULIUS CAESAR

A Photo-Masterpiece in Six Reels

Posed and Executed in and about Rome, Italy. Period 80 B.C. to 44 B.C.

THE LAST DAYS OF POMPEII

Six Reels

SPARTACUS

Six Reels

Endorsed by Leaders in the Movement of Visual Instruction

These films can be rented at reasonable rates by institutions and other exhibitors in New York State and New England from our New York office; in the State of Illinois from our Chicago office. Other territories are covered by State Universities and the films can be rented direct from them.

For complete information in regard to the Exchange which will supply you, rental prices, booking dates, etc.,

Address

GEORGE KLEINE

729 Seventh Avenue
New York City

116 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Ill.

From a Junior High School Teacher

Camp Curtin Junior High School

Harrisburg, Pa.

July 30, 1923

"I am very much pleased with Place's Second Year Latin and cannot praise it too highly. It is a most attractive textbook as to its appearance,—good clear print, interesting illustrations, and splendid maps. The military diagrams are the clearest and best that I have seen in any edition of Caesar.

"The introduction to the Gallic War is exceedingly fine. Section 82 of the Introduction is invaluable.

"I like the arrangement of the book throughout,—the syntax is presented in the ideal way, and the marginal comments cannot fail to arouse the interest of the student.

"Dr. Place has vitalized the study of Caesar. I wish that his book might be placed in the hands of all students who are studying Caesar."

ANNA L. WEITMYER, *Teacher of Latin*

PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt.D.,
Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

576 pages

Price, \$1.68

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

Textbook and Teacher

D'OOGÉ: ELEMENTS OF LATIN

"Somehow pupils like to learn constructions from D'Ooge".
Not so difficult to explain when you consider that D'Ooge lessons are short; that explanations of grammatical principles are simple and direct; that the uncommon and the unnecessary in construction have been weeded out; that drills and reviews are always at hand to catch up and tie together.

Every page of "Elements of Latin" is sound pedagogy.

GINN AND COMPANY

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

LONDON

ATLANTA

DALLAS

COLUMBUS

SAN FRANCISCO

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVII, No. 4

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1923

WHOLE No. 454

THE ETRUSCAN PROBLEM

The available materials for the study of the Etruscan language include some 8,000 inscriptions, several of which are of considerable length, fragments of a linen book-roll containing about 1,500 words of largely continuous text, numerous personal and place names recorded by classical authors and in Latin inscriptions, and, finally, a score of Etruscan words preserved, along with their meanings, by the ancient writers. Numerous helps to the interpretation of these documents are supplied by our knowledge of Etruscan civilization, and by the works of art in connection with which many of the inscriptions have been preserved. Furthermore, the Etruscans lived for several centuries in such close association with the Greeks and the Romans that the ideas in the Etruscan texts are likely to be more or less familiar to us; we should therefore be able to follow hints which might escape us in the case of a more exotic language.

The first task in deciphering an unknown language is to determine the phonetic or other value of the written characters. This part of the Etruscan problem presents no very serious difficulty. The alphabet is derived from the Greek, and there are numerous Latin loan-words in Etruscan and Etruscan loan-words in Latin by which to check inferences from the origin of the characters. Present knowledge of Etruscan pronunciation is slight by comparison with what we know of this side of Greek and Latin, but it is ample for the needs of interpretation.

For the rest, there are two recognized methods of procedure—the method of etymology and the method of combination. If the language to be interpreted is related to a known language, it is possible to make comparatively rapid and certain progress by searching for familiar words and inflections. Largely by this method the Oscan and the Umbrian inscriptions have been read with the help of Latin, while Sanskrit has furnished an important clue to the meaning of the Avestan and Old Persian documents.

The method of combination starts with such obvious observations as that a word written over the artistic representation of a person is likely to be the name of the person, or that, of two names in an epitaph, the first is likely to belong to the deceased, the second to his or her father, or, less often, to a husband or a master. If a word occurs frequently within or after such pairs of names, it is likely to mean 'son', while less frequent words in similar surroundings will mean 'daughter', 'wife', etc. In studying longer texts one searches for phrases which are repeated in different surroundings or with minor variations, and argues step by step from the known to the still unknown. After the first compara-

tively easy inductions the method of combination is slow and laborious, and its results are commonly rather vague. One may prove that a certain word is a noun, but remain ignorant of its meaning, or that another denotes something offered in sacrifice without knowing whether this is meat or drink.

Many students of Etruscan have assumed its relationship with Latin, and have tried to employ both methods of interpretation. And yet it is obvious that, if Etruscan were an Italic dialect, our knowledge of the language should exceed our knowledge of Oscan and Umbrian somewhat in proportion to the greater extent of the Etruscan documents. More plausible, but no more fruitful, have been the various attempts to connect Etruscan with Basque, Armenian, the Caucasian languages, or Finnish-Ugrian.

In the meantime the less ambitious method of combination has slowly given us a considerable mass of information. We know the Etruscan personal names fairly well, and, largely with their help, certain suffixes and inflexional endings have been identified. We know the names of many gods and heroes, several common nouns of relationship, most of the numerals up to 100¹, seventy-five or more other nouns and verbs, and ten or a dozen conjunctions and pronouns. It is possible to read many short dedications and epitaphs with substantial certainty. Something is known of the general content of the longer Etruscan texts, and we can make out occasional phrases and sentences in them.

In recent years several competent scholars have returned to the question of the relationship of the language, and gratifying progress has been made here also. To the literary, epigraphical, and archaeological data bearing on the matter has been added some cogent linguistic evidence.

The Greeks knew of *Τυρρηνοί* not only in Central Italy, but also in various Aegean localities, notably Lemnos and Attica, where they were also called *Πελαγιοί*. There were also traditions that the Italian Tyrrheni had migrated from the East. Hellanicus², an elder contemporary of Herodotus, says that Pelasgi from Thessaly, later called Tyrrheni, captured from the Umbrians the towns of Cortona and Caere, occupied a

¹There is still difference of opinion as to which numeral is which, but to me Franz Skutsch's identification of the first six seems virtually certain (*Indogermanische Forschungen* 5. 256-265; *Rheinisches Museum* 56. 638-639; Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 6. 799-802). Three others may be assigned to 7, 8, and 9, but the order is not yet definitely settled. The tens are mostly formed from the units with the suffix *-alχ*.

²A part of Hellanicus's account Dionysius of Halicarnassus quotes, in his *Antiquitates Romanae* 1. 28 (translated below). The fuller version of the story found in the same work, at 1. 17-22, is pretty certainly from Hellanicus in the main, although Dionysius in that passage carries through consistently his theory that Pelasgi and Tyrrheni were distinct.

great part of Campania, and founded there a new Larisa. Herodotus (1. 94), on the other hand, brings the Tyrrheni from Lydia in Central Asia Minor.

The most important ancient discussion of the question is by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 1. 25-30. Dionysius got together the available evidence, including a number of passages from early Greek writers which we know only through his citation of them, and subjected the whole to searching and scholarly criticism. If we disagree with some of his conclusions, that is because of additional evidence and points of view which could not be reached at his time.

In Chapters 17-22 Dionysius describes the migration of certain of the Pelasgi from Thessaly across the Balkan Peninsula by way of Dodona, up the Adriatic to the Southern mouth of the Po, and across Italy to Northern Etruria, which was then occupied by the Aborigines. He also tells of their settlement near the Aborigines, and of the successful warfare jointly waged by these two peoples against the Siculi, who then dwelt on both sides of the lower course of the Tiber. Chapters 23 and 24 relate the decay of the Pelasgian power in Italy, and the dispersal of the Pelasgians as a result of famine, disease, and civil war. In the course of time the Pelasgian race was spread over a large part of the world. Dionysius continues thus:

'25. They <i. e. the Pelasgi who had fled from Italy> surpassed many other peoples in the art of war, since they had practiced it at their own risk while living among warlike races, and, most of all, they were skilled in naval warfare as a result of having been neighbors of the Tyrrheni. Despair, which can give courage to men who lack their daily bread, was their general and their teacher in every undertaking, and so they won an easy victory wherever they went. They were called both Tyrrheni, from the name of the country from which they had come, and Pelasgi, from the history of their ancient race. I have mentioned this that no one, when he hears poets or historians use the name Tyrrheni of the Pelasgi, may wonder how the same people had both names.

Thucydides <4. 109> speaks of them as living in the Thracian Acte, and he mentions cities there whose inhabitants speak two languages. About the Pelasgian race he says, "There are Chalcidians there, but the majority are Pelasgi, namely some of those Tyrrheni who formerly inhabited Lemnos and Athens".

Sophocles makes the chorus in his *Inachus* speak anapaests as follows: "Father Inachus, son of Ocean's fountains, mighty ruler over Argive acres and Hera's hill-tops, and over Tyrrhene Pelasgi".

At that time, in fact, the name Tyrrhenia became current in Greece, and all Western Italy lost its various names, which differed according to population, and received that one designation—a thing which has happened to the Peloponnesus particularly among Greek lands; for, after one of the races which dwelt there, the whole peninsula has been called Achaia although Arcadians, Ionians, and many other races live in it.

26. The time when the Pelasgian power <in Italy> began to decline was about the second generation before the Trojan war; but it was not until about the end of the Trojan war that the race was reduced to its least extent. Except Croton, a considerable city in Umbria, and such other towns as were repopled by the Aborigines, the Pelasgian settlements were destroyed. Croton long preserved its ancient aspect, and it was not

long ago that it changed its name and its inhabitants it is now a Roman colony, called Cortona^a.

When the Pelasgi left the country, their cities were occupied by their various neighbors, and by far the most and the best of them fell to the Tyrrheni. The Tyrrheni are by some accounts natives of Italy, by others foreign emigrants. Those who hold that they are natives say that their name was given them from the fortifications which were first constructed by them in that region; for among the Tyrrheni, as well as among the Greeks, roofed buildings on city walls are called *τύρραι*. Quite by chance, it is thought, they were named in the same way as the Mosynoeci in Asia; for the latter dwell in wooden, frame structures as high as towers, which they call *mosynae*.

27. Those who repeat the legends that represent the Tyrrheni as emigrants say that Tyrrhenus was the founder of the colony and that it was named for him. The story goes that he was a Lydian by race, that he early moved from the country which was formerly called Maconia, and that he was a descendent of Zeus in the fifth generation. Manes, son of Zeus and Ge, was the first king in this land; to him and Callirhoe, daughter of Ocean, was born Cotys; Cotys married Halie, daughter of Tyllus, son of Ge, and had two sons, Asias and Atys; to Atys and Callithea, daughter of Choraëus, were born Lydus and Tyrrhenus. While Lydus stayed at home and inherited his father's kingdom, so that the country of Lydia was named for him, Tyrrhenus, it is said, founded a colony, reduced a large part of Italy to his sway, and imposed his name upon his followers.

Herodotus <1. 94>, however, says that Tyrrhenus and his brother were sons of Atys, who was the son of Manes, and that the migration of the Maconians to Italy was not voluntary. His version is about as follows. During the reign of Atys the crops in the country of the Maconians were insufficient. For a while, on account of their preference for <remaining in> that region, the people invented various remedies for their unhappy lot; every other day they would eat a moderate amount of food, and on the alternate days they would endure hunger as best they could. But, since the famine persisted, they divided the entire populace into two parts, and cast lots to see which half should leave the country and which should remain; and the sons of Atys cast lots on the same terms. The division headed by Lydus won the better fortune of remaining; the other half of the people, whose lot it was to emigrate, received its share of the national wealth, set out for the Western parts of Italy, where the Umbrians were settled, and, after establishing themselves there, founded cities which were still in existence in Herodotus's day.

28. I am aware that many other writers also have employed this myth about the stock of the Tyrrheni, some in the same form, others with a change of the founder of the colony or of the date. For some have said that Tyrrhenus was the son of Heracles by Omphale, the Lydian <queen>, and that, upon his arrival in Italy, he drove the Pelasgi out of a part of their cities, those, namely, which lay across the Tiber to the north. Others declare that Tyrrhenus was the son of Telephus, and that he came to Italy after the capture of Troy.

On the other hand, Xanthus, the Lydian, who knows early history as well as any man and who would not be considered inferior to anyone as an authority on the history of Lydia, does not anywhere in his history name Tyrrhenus as a ruler of the Lydians; and he does not know that a Maconian colony landed in Italy. He makes no mention of Tyrrhenia as a Lydian colony, although he has recorded other matters of less im-

^aThe reading is *Κορθωρία* or *Κοθωπρία*; but there is no doubt Cortona is the place meant, and we should substitute the name which the Romans actually used.

portance. He does, however, say that the sons of Atys were Lydus and Torrebus (Τόρρηβος)¹, that, after dividing their father's kingdom, both remained in Asia, and that the peoples over which they ruled were named for them. Xanthus's words are "From Lydus they are called Lydi, and from Torrebus, Torrebēbi. Their languages differ a little, and the two divisions of the race still make fun of each other for not a few expressions, just as the Ionians and the Dorians do".

Hellanicus of Lesbos says that after the Tyrrheni, previously called Pelasgi, had settled in Italy, they adopted the name which they now have. He gives the myth, in his Phoronis, as follows: "The son of Pelasgus, their king, and Menippe, daughter of Peneus, was Phrastor; his son was Amyntor, the son of Amyntor was Teutamides, and the son of Teutamides was Nanas. While Nanas was king, the Pelasgi were driven away by the Greeks, and, having left their ships in the Adriatic at the Southern mouth of the Po, they captured the city of Croton² in the interior. From there they colonized the region which is now called Tyrrhenia".

Myrsilus, disagreeing with Hellanicus, says that, after the Tyrrheni had left their own country, they changed their name, during their wanderings, to Pelargi, by comparison with the birds called storks <πελαργοί>, which in flocks used to visit Greece and the lands of the barbarians. He says it was they who built the so-called Pelargic wall about the acropolis of the Athenians.

29. In my opinion, however, they are all mistaken who believe that the Tyrrheni and the Pelasgi were one and the same people. That they were called by each other's name was not strange, since other nations also, both Greek and barbarian, have had the same experience as a result of their being neighbors, as for example the Trojans and the Phrygians (by many persons these two have been considered a single race, differing in name but not in fact). Now, this confusion of name has occurred in Italy no less than elsewhere; there was, in fact, a time when the Latins, the Umbrians, the Ausonians, and many others were called Tyrrheni by the Greeks, since the fact that those peoples dwelt far away made accurate distinctions difficult for distant observers. Rome itself many authors have thought to be a Tyrrhenian city. So I believe that the nations <i.e. the Pelasgi and the Tyrrheni> changed their names as they did their way of life; that both belonged to the same race I do not believe, and I infer this from many facts, but especially from the dissimilarity of their languages, which do not preserve any likeness. "For", says Herodotus <1. 57>, "the people of Croton³ have not the same language as those who now dwell in their neighborhood, and neither have the people of Placia <in Mysia>, but the people of Croton and of Placia have the same language. Clearly they preserve the form of speech which they carried with them when they migrated to these regions". And yet one might be surprised that the people of Croton had a dialect similar to that of the inhabitants of Placia near the Hellespont (as both were originally Pelasgi), whereas their speech was not similar to that of their nearest neighbors, the Tyrrheni. If relationship is to be assumed as the cause of similarity of speech, no doubt the opposite is to be thought responsible for dissimilarity of speech; for it is impossible to explain both phenomena in the same way. It would, on the one hand, be understandable that members of

the same race who had settled far from one another should no longer preserve the same type of speech on account of their intercourse with their neighbors; but that those who dwell in the same region should not resemble one another in speech at all, although sprung from the same race, that is not to be understood.

30. On the basis of this evidence I believe that the Pelasgi were distinct from the Tyrrheni. Just so I believe that the Tyrrheni were not Lydian colonists. They are not of the same speech, and it is not possible to hold that, while they no longer use a similar language, they do preserve some evidences of their mother country; for they do not worship the same gods as the Lydians, and they do not have similar laws and customs, but in these respects they differ more from the Lydians than from the Pelasgi. Probably they come nearer to the truth who declare that the <Tyrrhenian> nation did not come from any foreign land, but was indigenous, since it is very ancient and is not found to have the same language or the same way of life with any other nation.

They may have been called by the name <Tyrrheni> by the Greeks on account of living in towers, and they may have been named for a king. The Romans designate the race by other titles. They call the people Etrusci from the country called Etruria, where they formerly lived. The Romans also call them Tusci, from their skill in carrying on the worship of the gods, in which they excell other men. This name is now rather obscure, but formerly they pronounced it more accurately, as the Greeks say *θύσασκοι*⁴. The Tyrrheni call themselves Rasena from one of their leaders, who had that name⁵.

Dionysius's evident impatience with the myth of the Lydian famine and the overseas voyage of half the Lydian population is a feeling with which we can readily sympathize. That the story is false, at least in the form in which Herodotus tells it, our author shows quite clearly. Xanthus's account of the division of Atys's kingdom between his two sons, both of whom remained in the East, amounts to a contradiction of Herodotus's version of the myth; it cannot be waved aside on the ground that Xanthus omitted part of the story. The other argument against the Lydian origin of the Etruscans is that they differed from the Lydians in language, religion, laws, and customs. In this matter Dionysius is, on the whole, supported by recent discoveries, although there are some striking resemblances between the Etruscans and the Lydians in all these respects.

It is not necessary to suppose that Herodotus invented the tale. He certainly had some Lydian source aside from Xanthus (see Christ, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 1. 429). There may have been a Lydian myth deriving the Aegean Tyrrheni from Lydia; there is little doubt about the relationship of the Lydians with the primitive Aegean peoples. A combination of such a myth with an abbreviated form of the story of the Pelasgian colonization of Italy might yield the narrative which we find in Herodotus. The second son of Atys, according to Xanthus, had a name which, (if we adopted the correct reading above, Note 4), could easily be worked over into the name of the Tyrrheni. Τόρρηβος differs from Τυρρηνός in only two letters. It is probably a coincidence that the change from *o* to *u* would have been necessary if the

¹The manuscripts have Τόρρηβος, but Stephanus of Byzantium, sub voce, and Plutarch, *De Musica* 15 = 2.1136 C (with variant Τόρρηβος), record the form given above. It is not quite certain which is correct; see below, page 27, column 2.

²The reading σιλλοῦσιν seems preferable to σιλοῦσιν.

³That is, Cortona; see above, Note 3.

⁴Κροτωνιῆται in the manuscripts of Dionysius, Κροτωνιῆται in the manuscripts of Herodotus; the former is doubtless correct. For the meaning, see above, Note 3.

⁵"Sacrificial priests"; for the true etymology of *Tusci*, see below.

former name had been transferred to the Etruscan language, which lacked the sound *o*.

Dionysius held that the Etruscans were native to Italy. He accepted the Greek tradition of Pelasgian settlements in Italy, but he thought that the Pelasgi, after being weakened by internal dissensions, were supplanted by other races, particularly the Etruscans. His neat distinction, however, between Pelasgi and Tyrrheni meets with serious difficulties both in the East and in the West. He explains away the references in Greek writers to Tyrrheni in the Aegean region as being due to a comparatively late confusion of name. No such confusion is likely in the Egyptian records, which include Tyrrheni, called Turš in the hieroglyphs, among the pirates who invaded Egypt in the thirteenth or the fourteenth century B. C. If there were Tyrrheni in the Eastern Mediterranean about 1,300 B. C., it is probable that the fifth century writers who speak of them as occupying certain Aegean lands are nearer the truth than Dionysius. As to Italy, no confirmation has yet been discovered for Dionysius's distinction between Pelasgian Cortona and the cities of the Tyrrheni. Cortona seems to have been typically Etruscan in language as well as in civilization. Dionysius thought that the Pelasgi were Greeks (*Antiquitates Romanae* i. 20, ad initium, 21, ad initium, etc.), and his certainty that their language differed from Etruscan may have been largely based upon the obvious difference of Greek from Etruscan. Dionysius probably misinterpreted the passage which he cited from Herodotus in this connection. When Herodotus said that the language of Cortona differed from that of the neighboring peoples, he—or his source—probably thought of Cortona as a typical Etruscan town: he is telling us that Etruscan differed from Latin, Umbrian, etc.

This distinction between Pelasgi and Tyrrheni doubtless seemed to Dionysius his chief contribution to the subject and there is no denying the skill with which he works the traditional material into the scheme. The theory, however, is no longer tenable, and our chief debt to him is for the scholarly way in which he has set down the mass of evidence that made against his view. Quite clearly the weight of ancient opinion derived the Etruscans from the East, and, except for Herodotus and his followers, from the Aegean region, rather than from Lydia.

(To be concluded)

YALE UNIVERSITY

EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT

REVIEWS

Anaximander's Book, The Earliest Known Geographical Treatise. By W. A. Heidel. Boston: Proceedings of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Volume 56, Number 7, pages 239-288 (April, 1921). \$1.00.

However fantastic Anaximander's speculations on astronomy and the form of the earth may seem—he thought the earth was a cylinder on whose upper circular surface was the habitable part—, this pioneer of early Greek science will always be remembered for

two things of primal importance for mathematical geography. The first is the invention (or rather, the introduction to the Greek world from Babylonia) of the *gnomon*, or primitive sun-dial, which remains the only instrument known to the Greeks down to the time of the great Alexandrine astronomer-geographer Eratosthenes, in the third century B. C., for determining terrestrial latitudes. The second is his earliest map of the earth's surface, to be used in connection with his, the earliest, geographical treatise.

The importance of Anaximander's inventions and of his great work *On Nature* for the beginning of geographical knowledge among the Greeks is, then, excuse enough for the critical and exhaustive study of Professor Heidel before us and for a brief summary of his conclusions here. In short, it may be said that, between the covers of this brochure, so packed with information and reasonable inference, everything has been garnered that can shed any light on the achievements of the Ionian scientist and his lost book. The author is, moreover, exceptionally well equipped for his task, since he has long been interested in Pre-Socratic philosophy. In 1910 he published his *Περί Φύσεως*, *A Study of the Conception of Nature among the Pre-Socratics* (Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Volume 45, pages 79-133), and since that time he has been engaged on a study of Hecataeus.

The book under review is divided into three sections. Part I, containing one-half of the whole work (240-266), is largely concerned with a discussion of Anaximander's book and with showing that it was partly devoted to geography. Dr. Heidel concludes that the Ionian scientist wrote such a book, that it was current in antiquity, and was regarded as genuine. He argues that the titles of various works attributed to Anaximander by the lexicographer Suidas—*Tour of the Earth*, *On the Fixed Stars*, *Sphere*, and 'some other treatises' (not specified), are, like the title *On Nature* itself, late in origin, and "quite possibly at least in part" (252) sub-titles of the latter, thus indicating its wide scope. He rightly points out that in the sixth and fifth centuries writers did not prefix titles to their books, but that their contents were generally given in introductory sentences, and that the geographer-historian Ephorus of the fourth century B. C. was the first to divide his work into books. But the older custom was inconvenient for the later librarians, especially for those at Alexandria, and these, therefore, would invent and list various titles in their catalogues, which referred, after all, to the same book. Such a title as *Tour of the Earth*, then, if it were so used, merely shows that a part of Anaximander's great work was geographical in character, just as a similar part of Hecataeus's treatise was. This part may even have gotten detached from the main work and may have led a separate existence. As for the title *Sphere*, Dr. Heidel thinks it was quite natural for Anaximander to attempt a graphic (or even plastic) representation of the heavens as well as of the earth, in order to make clear the obliquity of the zodiac, which he discovered.

The map of the earth is first attributed to Anaximander in the handbook of Diogenes Laertius entitled *Lives of the Philosophers*, written in the first century B. C. Through what intermediaries Diogenes got the knowledge, we cannot determine. But his testimony is supported by the geographical tradition, especially by statements of Strabo and Agathemerus. Thus Strabo, in two passages, quotes the great geographer Eratosthenes as saying that Anaximander was a geographer, and in the second that he made a map, adding that in his day a geographical treatise was attributed to him, which he, however, did not regard as sufficiently authenticated. The geographer Agathemerus, of the third century A. D., also states that Anaximander was the first to 'venture to depict the inhabited world on a tablet'.

Dr. Heidel next (255-265) discusses the opinions found in Greek writers which have generally been assigned by modern scholars to a younger Anaximander. Only two brief notices refer unequivocally to such a writer. One, in Diogenes Laertius, speaks of him as 'another Anaximander', a historian of Miletus who wrote in Ionic Greek. The other, in Suidas, tells us that such a historian lived in the time of Artaxerxes Mnemon (who reigned 405-359 B. C.), and wrote a book entitled *Interpretation of Pythagorean Symbols*. Of three references in Greek literature generally attributed to this Younger Anaximander, two are assigned by Professor Heidel to the Elder. Thus, a scholiast on Dionysius Thrax (citing Apollodorus, *On the Catalogue of the Ships*, as authority) mentions Anaximander along with Dionysius and Hecataeus as believing that Danaus and not Cadmus introduced the alphabet into Greece. Professor Heidel, following a hint thrown out by Professor Diels, justifies this reference to the Elder Anaximander, and argues from it that the latter's work *On Nature* was therefore historico-geographical as well as cosmological in character—and that the scholium bears out his contention that Suidas's bibliography was derived from the catalogues of the Alexandrine libraries. Further, Athenaeus mentions a *Heroology* of Anaximander, which again is referred to the Elder as one of 'the other treatises' hinted at by Suidas in his list of the latter's work. If it belongs to the Elder Anaximander, the *Heroology* again shows the scope of the work *On Nature*, which must then have dealt, *inter alia*, with the legendary story of the Greeks. On the other hand, a third reference found in the *Symposium* of Xenophon, which mentions an Anaximander as an interpreter of texts and as the teacher of Niceratus, is referred to the Younger Anaximander (265), as the scene of the dialogue is laid in 421 B. C., not far back of the *floruit* of the Younger, 405 B. C., as given by Suidas.

Part II (266-278) deals with the philosophical content of Anaximander's book—the origin of the cosmos from infinitude and its history to its final resolution in the future into infinitude again. Since the "crowning achievement" of the so-called Milesian School of Philosophers was its dominant interest in chronology and historical science, the cosmos was de-

scribed, its parts duly ordered with the earth as the center. To Anaximander this world was only one of an infinite number, past, present, and future, which he called 'gods'. Phenomena of the cosmos were here explained—the obliquity of the zodiac, eclipses, nature of the heavenly bodies, origin of the sea and its saltiness, and certain meteorological phenomena—, such topics as Aristotle later treated in his *De Caelo*, his *De Generatione et Corruptione*, and his *Meteorologica*, although it is clear that Aristotle knew little of Anaximander's book. Besides, he seldom mentions the names of any of his predecessors.

In Part III (278-288) Professor Heidel discusses the extra-doxographic sources of information about the early Milesian thinkers, and especially Anaximander. The "doxographic", or philosophical, tradition is derived immediately from Theophrastus and hence is Aristotelian. We have, therefore, to get behind Aristotle, and, wherever possible, check his statements by information other than that collected by the doxographi. Plato stood behind Aristotle, but he unfortunately gives us only meager, though valuable, statements about his predecessors. Behind him we find no references in the works of the philosophers to one another which are of assistance in reconstructing their ideas, but only a tradition about the concepts 'philosopher' and 'philosophy' (279), especially in Heraclitus and the Pythagoreans, whose ideas came through Socrates to Plato and Aristotle. The chief interests of the Milesian thinkers—chronology, geography, ethnography, and biology—could not be included to any great extent in the scope of philosophy proper, and hence a great deal of the early Greek scientific thought must lie outside the philosophical tradition. Thus Herodotus tells us much about the scientific achievements of Thales; but he never mentions Anaximander or Anaximenes, and speaks of Hecataeus only in ridicule, although he was indebted to him for most of the second book of his history. For Anaximander, then, we have to descend much further than the fifth century. Thus, Aelian tells us that he led in the colonization of Apollonia in Thrace; Favorinus, that he set up a sundial in Sparta; Pliny—quoting the astronomer Eudemos—, that he discovered the obliquity of the ecliptic and found the date for the heliacal setting of the Pleiades; Eudemos, that he explained the sizes and the intervals of the planets; Plutarch and Censorinus, that he theorized about the origin of man from fishes; and Eratosthenes—the source of the statements of both Strabo and Agathemerus—, that he invented a map (283-284).

Dr. Heidel concludes his investigation of Anaximander's lost book with an attempt to frame a picture of it (287-288). He finds that its spirit was historical, since it sketched the life-story of the cosmos, and that its exposition was chronological, since it discussed the origin of the world and of the earth and of life, the evolution of species, and especially that of man and the spread of civilization. Heroic genealogies seem to have joined the interval between the beginnings and the dispositions of peoples and their habitats in Anaxi-

mander's day. At that point also probably appeared the explanations of natural phenomena. The nature of the book made it soon antiquated, though the later schools of philosophy and geography were always interested in it. One part of it—*Tour of the Earth*—like the similar portion of Hecataeus's *Genealogies* (or *Histories*)—in some way got detached from the main work, and lived on separately, until finally, at the height of Alexandrine criticism, it was reclaimed for its author by Apollodorus.

Dr. Heidel's brochure is remarkably free from typographical and other errors. Despite the fact that its style is at times too compact, and even labored and involved, and that it is marked here and there by certain mannerisms, on the whole nothing but praise can be given to the author's attempt to reconstruct the contents of what is "for us the earliest known prose treatise and the earliest known literary document, whether in verse or prose" (287) of early Ionian science. It is only unfortunate for us that the book was lost, and that the ancient record of it is so meager and grudging, since from Anaximander and his book so many streams of tradition can be followed, "growing in volume and progressively differentiating themselves" (286), until finally they have developed separate sciences—cosmogony, scientific medicine, geography, history, metaphysics.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy. By John Dean Bickford. Princeton: Published by the Author (1922). Pp. 65.

The purpose of this Princeton University dissertation is "to investigate a particular topic in ancient comedy, of perhaps some intrinsic interest, and to draw . . . whatever conclusions it seemed possible to reach as to the development of comedy, and to some extent of drama as a whole among the Greeks and Romans" (Preface). The subject seems at first sight an odd one to choose for a dissertation, in view of Leo's elaborate study, *Der Monolog im Drama* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1908), not to speak of the same author's *Plautinische Forschungen*¹ (Berlin, Weidmann, 1912) but Dr. Bickford justifies himself by showing that his purpose is to a large extent different from Leo's. Leo was concerned primarily with the position of the soliloquy in the play and its importance in helping us to distinguish the main divisions ('acts'); Dr. Bickford asks what was its function in "the development of the plot and situation to their proper conclusion" (16), or, as he calls it, the "structure"—not a very good term. He defines soliloquy as a passage spoken by a character in the play who believes himself to be alone or deliberately ignores the presence of others. All the prologues spoken by individuals are therefore excluded, except those in the Mercator and the Miles, which are spoken by characters within the play.

There are four chief topics: (1) the types of soliloquy, (2) their functions in the structure of the plays,

(3) the relation of the soliloquy in Roman Comedy to the soliloquy of the Greek New Comedy, and (4) the causes of the development of the soliloquy to the forms of it which occur in the New Comedy and in Plautus and Terence (1). These four topics are treated in eight chapters:

I. The Types of Soliloquy (3-15), II. The Function of the Soliloquy in the Structure (16-18), III. The Relation Between Latin and New Greek Comedy in Respect to the Soliloquy (19-27), IV. The Relation Between the Chorus and the Soliloquy (28-34), V. The Causes of the Development of the Structurally Useful Soliloquy (35-41), VI. The Causes of the Development of the Structurally Useless Soliloquy (42-47), VII. Outside Influences on the Development of Soliloquy (48-50), VIII. The Relation Between Soliloquy and Meter (51-52).

There is also a long Appendix (53-65) in which the material is statistically arranged in several different ways.

Dr. Bickford classifies the soliloquies into twelve groups on the basis of content: soliloquies that take the place of the technical prologue, soliloquies of Exposition, Development or Explanation of the Plot, Announcement, Comment, Deliberation (here the speaker merely considers what course of action is to be followed), Characterization, Moralizing, Comedy, Topical-Rhetorical Monologue, Mixed, and Anomalous. The classification is perhaps a bit overdone and the last two classes are of course hardly types at all. Moreover, it is necessary to classify many cases according to their dominant, not their exclusive, content, for the groups overlap a great deal. They resist pigeonholing. Still, it does no real harm to be as exact as possible, and Dr. Bickford indicates in his four Tables, in the Appendix, the numerous soliloquies that have a double character.

The importance of the soliloquy as an element of ancient drama is shown by the fact that there are in Plautus, for example, no less than 193 (not counting a few brief ones). They constitute 17% of the total text of his plays, whereas Hamlet has but 7%. For Terence and Menander (the three best preserved plays) the figures are respectively 12% and 32%. Considered from the point of view of their importance to the development (structure) of the plays, the figures are equally striking. Of the 193 in Plautus, 70 are "necessary", 9 "useful", 114 "not useful" (17); in Terence 22 are necessary, 4 useful, 26 not useful; in Menander 12 are necessary, 6 useful, 16 not useful. This shows that Plautus cared much less than Menander or Terence (the *dimidiatus Menander*), whether his soliloquies had any real value in the development or not, and suggests that he may have made additions here to what he found in his Greek originals.

The most important types numerically are those of Comment (68 in Plautus, 24 in Terence, 13? in Menander), Development (34 in Plautus, only 2 in Terence, only 3 in Menander), and Comedy (23 in Plautus, only 8 in Terence, none in Menander). The first two classes give information to the audience. When it is remembered that the types called Exposition and An-

nouncement also have the same function of making the action clear (so, too, often soliloquies of Deliberation), it becomes apparent how very careful the ancient dramatists are in this respect. In Plautus (including also the two soliloquies of the prologue type), 127 out of 193 have this purpose, in Terence 44 out of 52, in Menander about 24 out of 34, although for Menander the figures are not very reliable, since the beginnings of the three plays used for the statistics are lost. If they were complete, however, the figure would be still higher, since the beginning is the expository part of the play.

The soliloquy is such an important element of comedy that it is decidedly worth while to determine to what extent Roman comedy, especially Plautus, here represents its originals. Dr. Bickford discusses this question in Chapter III, and comes to the conclusion that the reflection is in general a very accurate one. The evidence is, however, not everywhere very substantial, and it seems to me that the author does not make enough allowance for Plautine freedom in the treatment of the Greek. He urges, first, that Terence agrees remarkably with Plautus both in the types of soliloquies employed and in their relative number, and that Terence was a close follower of the Greeks, and he infers (20) that "Plautus's treatment of those types of soliloquy that are found also in Terence, likewise their place, or lack of place, in the structure of his plays, may safely be assumed to be the same as that of the Greek originals". Plautus does indeed agree remarkably with Terence in the respects noted above, but there are some striking differences. He uses 23 soliloquies of Comedy (for mere purposes of fun) to Terence's one. If the proportions were maintained, we should find (say) 7 of those in Terence. Dr. Bickford thinks (22) that this difference is due to selection by Terence of "originals of a type less likely to contain such soliloquies", or to omission, and he shows from Terence's prologues (*Heauton* 31-32, *Eun.* 36, 41), that he disliked at least one kind of comic soliloquy—that of the *servus currens*. According to this argument Terence rather avoided this type, while Plautus took it over wherever he found it. But there is also the possibility that Plautus, who palpably liked this sort of thing, may have added some where he did not find them in his Greek original, or he may have transformed some which were not comic into the comic type. This would have been easy to do, since many soliloquies are hardly connected at all with the action and so no important inconsistencies would arise.

The possibility of Plautine freedom is strengthened by other considerations. Plautus has 13 soliloquies of Announcement, Terence 0. Dr. Bickford sees no significance in this, since both have so many examples of the closely related types of Development, Comment, and Deliberation. But do not the figures show that Plautus was not content with the other types, but strove to make the action more than clear by means of this additional type? Dr. Bickford quotes Henry Ward Beecher's remark that you must tell an audience

the same thing three times, once that it is going to happen, then that it is happening, finally that it has happened, after which some of them may understand. Plautus well understood this, especially when trickery was going on, or when the action was a bit complicated, and, having once learned the methods from the Greek, it is probable that he employed them sometimes where his models and Terence were not so naïve. The same inference may be drawn with regard to the so-called Anomalous soliloquies, of which Plautus has five, Terence 0. These are not intended to make the action clear, but one of them certainly looks Roman: the choragus passage, *Curc.* 462 ff. Perhaps some of the Topical-Rhetorical type also, of which Terence has none, may represent Plautine work, since there seems to be nothing quite like them in the Greek. But the latter are few (only four), so that the lack of Greek analogues may be accident, just as it is pretty certainly accident that there is no good Greek analogy for the two soliloquies that take the place of prologues (*Merc.* 1 ff., *Miles* 79 ff.).

Dr. Bickford shows that all the types, except the two last mentioned, are Greek, that they are perhaps even more frequent in Greek, and that they play the same rôles in the development of the play. It is clear that Plautus and Terence took over this part of the Greek technique, whatever changes they may have made in the position of the soliloquies and in other details. But it is not very safe to infer from the Latin plays the percentage of lines allotted to soliloquies in lost originals. This method does not allow for omissions and padding in the Latin. Moreover, one has to be sure of the originals when he attempts to name the Greek poet. Dr. Bickford assigns the original of the *Mostellaria*, for example, to Philemon, which is indeed the current view, but the evidence is not very convincing. A good case could be made out for Theognetus.

Dr. Bickford argues correctly that Plautus shows no development of technique in the use of soliloquies, but, in comparing the earlier with the later plays, he places the *Menaechmi* in the former group, dating it (compare 408-409 nunc *Hierost*) about 215 B. C. (27). But *Hiero* reigned from about 269, perhaps earlier, to 215 B. C., and the reference probably comes from the Greek original. It would have been better to use the *Miles*, which may be certainly dated before 200 B. C., and this would not have altered the result, since the *Miles*, with 12% of soliloquies, closely resembles the *Menaechmi*, which has 14%.

In order to explain historically the presence and the functions of the soliloquy in the New Comedy and in Plautus and Terence, Dr. Bickford follows its development through tragedy and Old Comedy and shows that in that period all the soliloquies are "useful" and in general well motivated until we get to Euripides, who takes a long step towards the condition which we find in the New Comedy. Euripides shows a strong liking for the soliloquy, almost entirely abandons motivation for his expository soliloquies, and uses the soliloquy when he can get the chorus out of the way; if he could have

got rid of the chorus entirely, he would probably have developed the soliloquy still further. The gradual increase in the use of the soliloquy is thus closely connected with the gradual disappearance of the chorus, and Euripides, not Aristophanes, seems to have exerted the paramount influence, so far at least as the "useful" soliloquy is concerned, just as he did in the related matter of the expository prologue. Many functions which had belonged especially to the chorus were taken over, as the chorus decreased in importance, into the soliloquy, e. g. announcement, comment, moralizing, etc. This was in part connected with the increase in the importance of novelty of plot: a story unfamiliar to the audience needed explanation, and the soliloquy was the easiest method.

For the "useless" soliloquy, on the other hand, the freedom of the Old Comedy seems to be the most important antecedent. In the soliloquies of Plautus we find the freedom of address, the unessential comic remarks, and the moralizing which had once characterized the parabasis, the stasimoi, and the paradoi of Aristophanes. Such things frequently occur in the fragments of the Middle and the New Comedy also, although in the majority of cases it is hard to say with

certainty that they are fragments of soliloquies. In general, Dr. Bickford does not prove very much in detail on this point, but he establishes a presumption that the soliloquy took over much that had once been characteristic of Old Comedy rather than of Euripides.

Among the outside influences on the soliloquy that of rhetoric is most important. Again the proof in detail is not strong, but the internal evidence of the soliloquies themselves is conclusive. We have trials (Trin. 223 ff.), elaborate comparisons (Most. 84 ff., the comparison of the young man's character to a house), attacks on marriage, love, philosophy, wealth, etc. It is clear that the Greek originals are in these matters reflecting the rhetorical themes and methods of their day.

Dr. Bickford has written a good and useful dissertation. His statements of facts are very accurate and he writes concisely. If his conclusions are not everywhere free from doubt, this is due rather to the fact that the evidence is incomplete and is susceptible of other interpretations, for he is often dealing with questions which cannot yet be solved to the satisfaction of the majority of scholars.

BYRN MAWR COLLEGE

ARTHUR L. WHEELER